

ing himself as a private soldier in the ranks and fighting our battles—and soon afterwards he took command of the detachment and distinguished himself throughout the war. Such had been the policy not only of the Federal Government, but of the Government of the State of Maryland. The most liberal and enlarged privileges had been allowed to the freemen of that day; and that policy had been continued until the adoption of the constitution of '76. It was true, indeed, that for a time the policy of the General Government had been changed, and a restrictive policy substituted. But the latter in its turn had been repealed, and been followed by a new and most liberal system. It taught the people of foreign countries, that our policy was to admit these persons upon more liberal terms than had been held out under former laws. It would be bad faith now to turn our backs upon them, and enact odious provisions against them, calculated to deprive them not only of their rights, but of their character.

Mr. B. referred to the services which had been rendered by the foreign population, and to the debt which was due to them—instancing especially the services rendered by them after the destruction of the capitol, in the defence of Baltimore. In all our civic and military struggles, these individuals had stood manfully up, and now we were to turn upon them and insult them. Not only had they fought our battles, but they had been among the foremost in the promotion of the charities of the land. He alluded to the school-houses they had built in Baltimore, and especially to an institution in Baltimore county, which had been built by the munificence of an Irishman, and which was known as "the Orphans' Home." He also referred to the late case of the McDonough bequest, in illustration of his point. And he concluded by expressing the hope that the Convention would not only act up to the vote it had given on Saturday last, but that it would reject the proposition before it, so as to indicate to the people of the State that although they were willing to entertain it as a matter of caution and respect to those who advocated it, yet that, as a body, the Convention was utterly opposed to its adoption.

[Mr. B. spoke about 35 minutes. The above is a mere outline of his points, but is considerably longer than the limit prescribed by the contract.]

Mr. SOLLERS stated that the gentleman from Anne Arundel had characterized some remarks which he had made on Saturday, as wild, extravagant and not worthy of notice. He felt himself called on to refer to the fact this morning, especially as

"A chiel's amang us takin' notes."

Mr. DORSEY explained that he did not use the phrase imputed to him, "not worthy of notice," but that he did not feel himself called on to notice the remarks.

Mr. SOLLERS resumed. That may be true, but the gentleman from Anne Arundel stated that the remarks were extravagant. As to his

political and party tendencies, whatever they may be, or whether his father was a whig or a democrat, was a matter of little import. It was not necessary to trace his lineage. But he felt called on to resist the assumption of an authority to compel the junior members of this body to sit still and say nothing. He desired to say that he had uttered not a single sentiment which had not emanated from his heart. The gentleman from Kent, the gentleman from Anne Arundel and the gentleman from Queen Anne had all introduced politics in their speeches, and in a style in comparison of which he had said nothing extravagant. He had thought it right to make this explanation, and to add that while he had no desire to assail the gentleman from Anne Arundel, he could not consent to sit silent when he himself was assailed.

The question was then stated to be on the amendment of Mr. Chambers.

Mr. Biser asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Dent, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Bond, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Phelps, Sprigg, McCubbin, McMaster and Hearn—21.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricard, Dalrymple, Sollers, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Colston, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Grayson, George, Dirickson, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardeastle, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Holiday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shover, Cockey and Brown—53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Brown indicated his intention to offer an amendment.

The Chair requested that the gentlemen would reduce it to writing.

Mr. CHAMBERS interposed, and desired the opportunity to state what his amendment was.

Mr. BRENT yielded the floor for the purpose.

Mr. CHAMBERS then declared his amendment to be in the following words:

"Every free white male citizen of the United States, of 21 years of age and upwards, who shall have resided in this State," &c.

Mr. BROWN referred to a case in which the amendment would operate unfairly. Suppose a man, living near the county line, acquired by purchase or bequest an estate lying over the line and in the adjoining county, and transfer his residence to the newly acquired property, is he to be compelled to remain six months at his new residence before he is permitted to vote in that county? While we ought to do all that we can to prevent persons from coming into a county for a brief residence, merely for the purpose of voting, we ought to be careful not to abridge the rights of honest citizens, whose right to vote is not questioned. The object of the constitution is to